

the 3 billion people who live on only \$2 a day. This kind of poverty is unacceptable and, quite candidly, it is dangerous to us and to the stability of the world. I think it is something we have to work to change. It is in our self-interest that we do so.

The fact is that foreign assistance has had an enormous impact when applied effectively. For example, over the past 50 years, our assistance has helped reduce infant child death rates in the developing world by 50 percent. We also have had a significant impact on worldwide child survival and health promotions, through initiatives, such as vaccinations and school feeding programs.

Agriculture is certainly another area of great success. Today, 43 of the top 50 countries that import American agricultural products have in the past received humanitarian assistance from the United States. Today, they are our customers. Our investment in better seeds and agricultural techniques over the past two decades have made it possible to feed an additional 1 billion people throughout the world.

Despite its importance and immeasurable value, our overall foreign affairs budget has been stagnant for the past 20 years. As I said, in real dollars, it has gone down. We currently use only about one-half of 1 percent of our Federal budget for humanitarian assistance. Yet this assistance is absolutely critical for people in war-ravaged, politically unstable, impoverished nations. The children, the elderly, and the civilian people are not responsible for the political and economic turmoil in their homelands, but they are the ones who always end up suffering the most.

Right now, increases in foreign assistance could make a very real difference around the world. One example is in our own backyard, and that is in the country of Haiti. I recently returned from a trip to Haiti, where I witnessed the tremendous devastation, destitution, and desperation of that country located less than 2 hours by plane from the shores of Miami.

Haiti remains the poorest country in the hemisphere. Democracy and political stability continue to elude the Haitian people. The already-dire humanitarian conditions of Haiti's 8.2 million people continue, tragically, to deteriorate. Today, less than one-half of their population can read or write. The country's infant mortality rate is the highest, by far, in our hemisphere. At least 23 percent of the children up to age 5 are malnourished. Only 39 percent of Haitians have access to clean water, and diseases such as measles, malaria, and tuberculosis are epidemic.

Haiti is also suffering from an AIDS crisis—really an epidemic. Roughly 1 out of 12 Haitians is living with HIV/AIDS. This is the highest rate in the world, outside of sub-Saharan Africa. According to the Centers for Disease Control projections, Haiti will experience up to 44,000 new HIV/AIDS cases

this year, and that is at least 4,000 more than the number expected in the United States. We have a population, obviously, a great deal higher than Haiti. They have a population of about 8 million people. Ours is nearly 35 times larger than theirs.

In addition, there are an estimated 30,000 to 40,000 deaths each year in Haiti from AIDS. Already, AIDS has orphaned 163,000 children. That number is expected to skyrocket to between 320,000 to 390,000 over the next 10 years. Haiti also continues to suffer from an unnecessarily high HIV transmission rate from mother to child. Some of this is easily prevented through proper counseling and medication. Currently, only one clinic in Port-au-Prince provides these critical, lifesaving services.

Indeed, things are bad in Haiti, and they stand to get only worse. Right now there is a great deal of money that the international community is holding up, awaiting reforms to be made, awaiting the Government of Haiti to settle disputes concerning the May 2000 election. I believe it is correct to withhold that money. But what it means is that the only assistance coming from many countries—certainly the only assistance coming from the U.S.—is the purely humanitarian assistance that does not go through the Government. That purely humanitarian assistance has gone down and down and down. We have taken it down for the last few years. The prospects are that we will take it down again this year. I think that is, quite bluntly, a mistake. It is a mistake for us to continue to reduce this humanitarian assistance. This is not money that is going to the Government of Haiti. This money is going to NGOs, private organizations, charitable groups that are dealing directly with the people of Haiti, who are helping with agricultural problems and challenges and helping them feed their children through school feeding programs and helping them with the AIDS problem. All of this work is done directly on the ground by people who are making a difference.

I think we should reconsider our position—the position we have seen in the past few years of continuing to ramp down that assistance that goes directly to these NGOs and to the people of Haiti. I believe we have a moral obligation to stay committed to these people, irrespective of what the Haitian Government does or does not do. The reality is that we need to increase foreign assistance across the board, not just the money that goes to protect the Haitian people but the much-needed aid that reaches all corners of the developing world. While we as a Nation must project strength, we also must project compassion.

Quite simply, providing humanitarian assistance is the right thing to do. It is also in our national interest to do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the coming debate on the energy bill which will be before this body sometime next week, at the pleasure of the majority leader, of course. I want to share with my colleagues the concern I have that somehow in this energy bill we may get into a debate—and it may be more than a debate. It may be pointing fingers at one another—with regard to the Enron situation. I think it is fair to say there is a lot of blame around here.

The objective and responsibility we have is to correct the damage that has been done to ensure it does not happen again, and if indeed we can find accountability, we should proceed with that process because that is part of our job.

In my opinion, as the former chairman of the Energy Committee and ranking member currently, we have going on a little politics both in the House and Senate. We are trying to create a political issue out of the Enron failure. I think it is fair to say at least some are not particularly interested in the facts. They are more interested in the rhetoric, which occasionally occurs around here.

What we have seen is the devastation with the employees, the stockholders, the billions that are lost, and retirement funds that have been wiped out. Indeed, I think we have to focus on the reality that this is a series of lies, a series of deceptions, a series of shoddy accounting, a series of corporate misconduct, a series of coverup. That is the bottom line. It should not have happened, but it did happen. I think it is fair to say our obligation goes to trying to protect the consumers and protect the stockholders.

One of the interesting things, though, as one who has followed the energy process very close, the failure of Enron really had nothing to do with the market price of electricity, the market price of national gas, or the market price to consumers in this country. It is very important to understand the system worked. In other words, Enron was buying and selling energy. They were not a great producer of energy. When they basically failed, those who were supplying Enron simply moved to other distributors. So the consumer was not hurt. Keep that in mind. This was a failure internally within this corporation that affected a lot of people, but it did not affect the ratepayers nor the supply in this country. The private system basically worked.

What are some of the issues surrounding the political gain or political consequences? I think we have to agree we should try and look at a bipartisan effort to present real solutions to America's energy problems. Some are interested in demonizing the President and the Vice President with stories that are somewhat misleading and off the focus of the reality of why this corporation failed. We have seen our good

friend over in the House, Congressman HENRY WAXMAN, issue a white paper entitled, "How the White House Energy Plan Benefited Enron." That is a pretty broad accusation.

Now I want to try and balance that a little bit because the Congressman asserts many policies in the White House energy plan are virtually identical to the positions Enron advocated. I want to look at the record for a few minutes.

The intended inference of the report, no matter how inaccurate, is that the administration's national energy policy was written solely to benefit Enron.

In my opinion, the logic of the Congressman leaves a little bit to be desired. To use that logic, we should be critical of any energy bill that helps meet our Nation's growing energy needs just because a company, for that matter any company, even one producing renewable energy, could benefit.

It is true some elements of the administration's energy policy are consistent with the views of Enron, but it is also true that far more elements of the Clinton administration's energy policy were consistent with the views of Enron.

I think we have to look at some of the facts. I am prepared to do that in the next few minutes. For example, one of the elements, according to a Washington Post story on January 12, in a meeting when Secretary of Energy Peña under the Clinton administration, and Ken Lay, who was the head of Enron, pressed the Clinton administration to propose legislation that would assert Federal authority over a national electricity market—now this is what the previous administration basically did. It was kind of interesting because some of the material that comes out of the research that is done by the media, that addresses some of the backroom meetings that went on, deserve the light of day, and I am prepared to share that briefly. I met with Ken Lay in my office on one occasion.

The purpose of Mr. Lay's meeting with me was to encourage me to support deregulation at a time certain of America's electric energy market. Under the deregulation plan he supported, there would be a simultaneous definite date under which various States would come in under deregulation. I was opposed to that.

That had happened, of course, in the California situation where we had a cap by the State of California on retail, and I felt we could not simply mandate everybody come in at the same time under deregulation. The fact that some have deregulated, like Pennsylvania, Texas, and other States, it has gone very well. Those States have seen a reduction in their electric rates. It still was not a perfect process. The States should have the opportunity for innovation and to deregulate over a period of time.

According to a company version of the meeting, Lay and Peña, after my meeting with Lay, agreed that a go-

slow approach to deregulation advocated by the Senate Energy Committee's chairman, FRANK MURKOWSKI, Republican of Alaska, was unacceptable. In other words, Peña had asked Enron officials to keep the Energy Department staffers posted on developments in Congress.

The point I want to make, and make very clear, is it would not have been in the national interest to have followed the objective of Ken Lay and Enron to open up simultaneous deregulation of the electric market. As indicated in the memorandum, in the meeting with Peña and Ken Lay—and Peña, again, was Secretary of Energy at that time—they agreed that my approach was too slow and unacceptable.

I want to compare where we are today because this is the issue, or the accusation, that somehow the energy plan proposed by the administration was out of the Enron playbook. I want to compare where the current energy bill is relative to the specifics that would be applicable to Enron if Enron were still a functioning corporation. So let us look at many of the elements of Senator DASCHLE's energy bill because I believe many of them are straight out of the Enron playbook in asserting Federal authority over a national electric market. I think it should be pointed out that Enron has never wanted to deregulate electricity. Instead, they want to Federalize electricity. Now there is a difference. It is the regulatory process. Enron wanted different regulations, not deregulation in the sense of my last remarks where I indicated the only thing they would support was simultaneous deregulation.

So they wanted different regulations. They wanted to preempt States and put FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, in charge. Enron wanted to create a one-size-fits-all system that benefits national marketers such as Enron—Enron is a national marketer. They did not produce power—and, on the other hand, ignore local concerns and interests, which is one of the reasons I objected. Enron wanted special provisions of particular benefit to that company.

I think Enron had every intention of getting a movement in their direction, and they had access to take their plans directly to the upper echelons of the leadership, and they did. What is the result? Let me share the result because this is where we are today. This is what this body is going to be looking at next week when we take up the Daschle energy bill.

First, this bill did not come before the committee of jurisdiction. That is the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. I am the ranking member. It was crafted in secret. It was crafted in violation of traditional Senate rules. And, in my opinion, to a large degree, it would have benefited Enron because the Daschle bill grants further authority to restructure the electric power industry. It allows FERC to take any action it may deem appropriate to cre-

ate competition as FERC sees fit. The Daschle bill grants FERC open access to all transmission lines. It gives FERC authority over transmission not now within the purview of federally owned and State owned. The Daschle bill creates uniform reliability standards under FERC control. That is something Enron opposed. The industry consensus relied on this because it would allow for regional differences. They did not want regional differences.

The Daschle bill includes transmission information disclosure. That benefited Enron's trading activities, provisions that require disclosure for potential commercial sensitive transactions that would have given Enron a complete and competitive advantage and helped them game the electric power market.

Further, the Daschle bill offers a special transmission access and benefit for wind generators and a renewable portfolio standard of benefits. As we know, Enron owns wind generation companies.

The Daschle bill includes Federal preemption of States on consumer protection. Enron wanted a uniform regulatory system, equally acceptable across State lines, regardless of different needs in different States.

Finally, the Daschle energy bill includes nationwide uniform interconnection standards. Again, Enron wanted a unified national system without talking and taking into consideration regional concern.

That is a partial wish list. As we look at the allegations back and forth of whose bill favors Enron, we should look at it fairly and objectively. This is a virtual wish list, in my opinion, for a company that made millions and millions of dollars trading electricity nationwide.

Enron's main goal was to create the federalized system found to a large degree in the Daschle bill before the Senate. By knocking down State rights in exchange for Federal command and control, Enron would have gained the substantial advantage in energy markets at the hands of State protections of consumers. In other words, the State has the obligation to protect its consumers.

One Senator referred to the Bush energy plan the other day as "a cash and carry" for Enron. If that is the case, perhaps the approach we have in the majority leader's bill ought to be "a quick check" as Enron got far more money and would have gotten far more money in the proposed bill before the Senate, the Daschle bill, than it did under the Bush energy plan. As I say, those who live in glasshouses should not throw stones and perhaps should not take baths.

I conclude with the situation surrounding the committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. We talk about ensuring that we have an energy supply to meet our Nation's needs. There is one place in this country where energy

is in great demand. In my opinion, that is this body of the Senate. Energy, energy, everywhere, in all sorts of committees—except one committee. That is the committee where it belongs, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

Through a press release issued late last October, Senator DASCHLE basically pulled the plug on the Energy Committee: The Senate's leadership wants to avoid quarrelsome, divisive votes in committee. That was how the release read.

What happened was, clearly, the majority leader did not like the writing on the wall, so he basically took and created his own bill and introduced it as the bill that will be considered by this body. I think the development of that bill was in the worst traditions of the Senate and was done without the open process associated with the committee requirements. There was no opportunity for Republican or Democrat amendments, and it was done far out of the reach of the public or input of the reach of the public, out of the glare of the media. That fact, in itself, should have the media howling. But I don't hear many of them howling. But their silence on that fact has been somewhat deafening.

In doing so, the committee of jurisdiction has simply not been allowed to meet. That is in clear violation of committee rules and Senate rules. But we have not met on any markup since October. That is a mandate from the majority leader to the committee chairman, Senator BINGAMAN.

What frustrates a lot of Members on the committee is that this is applicable only to the Energy Committee. Other committees have been allowed to meet, and they have not been pushed aside. For example, the Commerce Committee has been allowed to meet because they are having a vigorous debate about the controversial issues, CAFE standards for automobiles. It is a legitimate debate, and it belongs in the Commerce Committee. It is an energy debate that should be aired in public, in the press, and under scrutiny of public opinion. That is current. But the committee of jurisdiction is not allowed to meet on the underlying bill.

The Environment and Public Works Committee has been allowed to meet. They are having a vigorous debate about a controversial issue, and that is Price-Anderson, to help the nuclear plants that are online in this country. Again, it is an energy debate that should be aired in public, in the press, and under scrutiny. It is being done. Yet the underlying committee of jurisdiction is forbidden from meeting on the energy bill.

The Finance Committee has been allowed to meet. They are debating a wide variety of tax provisions to help spark the next generation energy sources for the country. Again, it is the energy debate that should be aired in public, in the press, and under scrutiny. And it is in the Finance Com-

mittee. But where is the Energy Committee, the committee of jurisdiction? Silenced—totally silenced in this debate.

As the ranking member, I will not be silenced. I don't think this is a fair process. We are using every avenue available to help make certain the Americans hear the voice on the other side in this debate. We will continue our effort to carry out the challenge that President Bush laid out in his State of the Union to make this Nation more secure in the face of the volatile and dangerous world in which we live. Energy security must be part of that debate, even if the Energy and Natural Resources Committee is not allowed to meet.

Finally, let me generalize on what the Daschle-Bingaman energy bill, S. 1766, provides. In general, the bill contains very little in the way of increasing domestic production of conventional forms of energy—oil, natural gas, coal, and nuclear. As a consequence of our energy dependence on imported oil, we are about 57 percent dependent. On September 11, we were importing just over a million barrels a day from Iraq. Currently, that is 750,000 barrels a day. One has to question whether indeed an energy bill should address our increased dependence on foreign sources of oil.

I am often reminded of a statement made by Mark Hatfield, who served in this body for a long, long—long time. He headed up the Appropriations Committee. He was a pacifist, if I can characterize him to some degree. But on this issue of increasing our imports of oil from the Mideast, he often said: I will support opening up ANWR, opening up oil discoveries domestically, on any occasion, rather than send one more American, man or woman, overseas to fight a war on foreign soil over oil.

That is what part of this debate is going to be about, because we have opportunities to increase domestic oil production. Some are going to say that we have other forms of energy, let's use them. We do, but the world moves on oil. Until we find another alternative, we are going to be increasing our dependence on very unstable sources: Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia. The consequences of that to the American people are, I think, severe.

We are going to have a debate in this body. There is going to be an effort to filibuster. The National Environmental Policy Act groups have been against us. This has been a cash cow for them. Opening up ANWR specifically is the lightning rod. Those organizations have gotten together and put fear in the American people that it cannot be opened up safely.

They suggest it is a 6-month supply. That is absolutely ridiculous. That would be like assuming there was no other energy produced in this country or imported for a period of 6 months.

They say it is somewhere between 5.6 and 16 billion barrels. If it were in the

middle, 10 billion barrels, it would equate to about 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in the United States. It would be the largest discovery, if you will, other than Prudhoe Bay. That is more oil than the proven oil reserves in Texas. Some say it will take 10 years. We built the Empire State Building in less than 2 years. We built a pipeline in a couple of years—800 miles. By permitting, we could get this oil on line in a couple of years.

When Members are going to vote on this issue, they are going to be torn by the pressures from America's environmental community that has milked this issue like a cash cow, for money and membership. When we eventually pass it, they are going to move on to another cause, make no mistake about it. I think we are all practical politicians who recognize that.

So these Members who stand here are going to have to make a vote on whether to be responsive to the environmental groups or do what is right for America—that is, to reduce our dependence on imported oil.

This bill favors reduction in energy demand through the creation of new Federal agency efficiency standards—I am talking about CAFE—and it also focuses on fuel and renewable energy technologies, all of which I support. But we have to be careful and recognize that it is very easy to set a goal for 2015 of 37 miles per gallon. We are around 24 miles per gallon now. Because in the year 2015 a lot of us are not going to be here, we are not going to be held accountable. So it is very convenient to put that off and say let's achieve a standard of 37 miles by the year 2015.

We have to concern ourselves with the safety of the automobiles. We have to concern ourselves with the mandate that Government is going to dictate what kind of car you drive, jobs protection in the industry—OK? These are considerations that I believe are paramount in the discussion on CAFE standards.

Some suggest the alternative is to let a scientific process set an achievable increase in CAFE standards, or mileage. That is the position I favor. Let's do what is attainable so we can be held accountable, not being held accountable by the year 2015, or thereabouts, for an amount that may not be practical, achievable, or maybe at a cost that is prohibitive—or at a cost of safety or maybe at a cost of jobs.

Further, this legislation does not appear to solve the pressing energy problems the United States will face in the next decade, acting, instead, as the energy policy for 50 years from now. That is not what we want to do. That is just putting it off. By our account, this bill creates 40 Federal programs, 12 new Federal offices, and authorizes 41 new studies related to energy policy.

I am going to have a lot more to say about this later. I conclude my remarks again with the reference that each Member here is going to be held

accountable for his or her vote and that accountability should be on what is right for America, not what the environmental lobby dictates.

I yield the floor.

I ask unanimous consent an article appearing in the AP entitled "U.S.-British Planes Bomb Iraq" dated Monday, February 4, be printed in the RECORD. We are importing 750 million barrels a day from Iraq at the same time we are bombing them.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Associated Press, Feb. 4, 2002]

U.S.-BRITISH PLANES BOMB IRAQ
(By Ben Holland)

ISTANBUL, TURKEY.—U.S. and British planes patrolling a no-fly zone over northern Iraq bombed Iraqi air defense systems Monday in response to anti-aircraft fire, U.S. officials said.

It was the first time U.S. and British planes had bombed Iraq's north since the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, said Capt. Brian Cullin, a spokesman for U.S. European Command in Stuttgart, Germany. The bombing came amid rising debate on whether Iraq will be the next target of the U.S. anti-terror campaign.

The bombs were dropped after Iraqi forces northeast of Mosul in northern Iraq fired on a routine air patrol, the U.S. European Command said in a written statement.

"All coalition aircraft departed the area safely," the statement said. Cullin said it would not be clear for some time how much damage was done to the Iraqi targets.

U.S. and British planes based in southeast Turkey have been flying patrols over northern Iraq since September, 1996. The two countries say the operation is designed to protect the Kurdish population of northern Iraq from Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein.

"There's a day-to-day commitment made by three very strong coalition partners . . . toward a population we still feel we have an obligation to protect," Cullin said.

Expectations that Iraq could be the next target of the U.S.-led anti-terror campaign were strengthened by President Bush's State of the Union address last week.

Bush said Iraq was part of an "axis of evil," along with Iran and North Korea, and accused it of seeking weapons of mass destruction.

Turkey, host to the air patrols and a launching pad for strikes against Iraq in the 1992 Gulf War, has expressed anxiety over the prospect of war in Iraq, fearing that the fall of the Baghdad regime could lead Kurds in northern Iraq to create a Kurdish state. That could in turn boost aspirations of autonomy-seeking Kurds in Turkey.

Turkey's Prime Minister, Bulent Ecevit, warned the Iraqi leader on Monday to admit U.N. weapons inspectors in order to head off possible U.S. military action.

Iraq has refused since 1998 to allow U.N. inspectors into the country to check if the Baghdad regime has dismantled its weapons of mass destruction. Baghdad has rejected a U.S. warning to admit the inspectors or face the consequences.

In a letter to Hussein, Ecevit warned of the "sever consequences to be encountered" if Iraq does not allow the inspection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Alaska, I always enjoy his presentations. He is always prepared. He believes fervently

in what he was addressing. I look forward to the debate we are going to have on ANWR and a number of other issues on this energy bill, which is going to come up next week. The majority leader indicated last year that it would be brought up before the Presidents Day break. That break is a week from today.

We are on the agriculture bill. I think we can see the end of that, as I mentioned to my friend from Alaska today. I hope we can be on the energy bill by next Wednesday and work on that for a few days next week and maybe a few days after that when we come back. But I look forward to the debate. It is something we need to do. Energy policy is so important to this country.

While there are divergent views on what that energy policy should be, that is the American system. We are going to come here, work through all this, and come up this year with what I hope is a finalized version after we finish our conference. It will be something to give us a long-term energy policy for this country.

AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION,
AND RURAL ENHANCEMENT ACT
OF 2001—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 2471

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the Crapo amendment, which was offered yesterday. I ask it be recalled for purposes of my offering an amendment to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 2838 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2471

Mr. REID. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2838 to amendment no. 2471.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2838, WITHDRAWN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amendment I just offered be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I saw a movie called "A Beautiful Mind." It is based upon a true story of a man by the name of John Nash who

is a mathematician from Blue Field, WV. He is probably one of smartest men ever born on this Earth. I was so fascinated by the movie that I read the book which was the basis for the movie. The book was even more intriguing, interesting, and fascinating than the movie. It was a thick book. It read like a novel. I couldn't put it down.

This brilliant man could see the solution to the most complicated math problems. He could see a solution to the problem before he determined how the solution came about. Most people work the other way. They work up to finding a solution. He knew the solution. After he found the solution, he would work out the problems so other people could understand how he arrived at the solution.

Just one example: He won a Nobel Prize for what is called game theory in economics. Certainly, I am no mathematician. I will not explain it very well.

But there was another eminent scientist who figured out what would happen between two people playing a game—whether it was checkers, or a game of cards, or a game of two people playing basketball. He would determine what the result would be. But John Nash said that is not good enough. What you need to do is figure out what would happen when large numbers of people participated in a game. If two people, or four people, or any amount of people were playing a game, he could determine what would happen. It sounds fantastic and unbelievable that you can do that through mathematics, but he did it.

One of the things that could be determined, for example, were moves of the military during the cold war. Through a mathematical formula using John Nash's theory, you could determine what would happen if the United States did this. This is what the Soviet Union would do.

I will not go into any more detail other than tell you he was a brilliant man. But sadly, he became a schizophrenic paranoid. He had people talking to him all the time who were real to him. These people talking to John Nash were as real as if we were speaking to our wives when we left home today or speaking to one of the Senate staff. He believed things that he heard. As the movie depicts, he saw people on occasion.

Obviously, I was fascinated by this movie and by this book, but listening yesterday to the people come to this Chamber and talk about my language in this farm bill made me think of this movie and this book. I am not accusing them of being paranoid or schizophrenic because they were talking about something they either knew nothing about or they were imagining things because they came down here talking about how bad my water legislation was and they simply were without any basis in fact. I don't know where this came from.